STATE OF WASHINGTON SNOHOMISH COUNTY SUPERIOR COURT STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY, No. Plaintiff, PROSPECTIVE PURCHASER CONSENT DECREE RE: FENCED v. AREA, EVERETT SMELTER SITE, EVERETT, WASHINGTON HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF EVERETT, Defendant. PROSPECTIVE PURCHASER CONSENT DECREE RE: FENCED

AREA, EVERETT SMELTER SITE

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

2		Page
3	I. INTRODUCTION	1
	II. JURISDICTION	
4	III. PARTIES BOUND	6
5	IV. DEFINITIONS	6
6	V. STATEMENT OF FACTS	8
	VI. DESCRIPTION OF PLANNED PROJECT	<u>14<del>14</del>13</u>
7	VII. WORK TO BE PERFORMED	<u>16<del>16</del></u> 14
8	VIII. ECOLOGY COSTS	
	IX. GRANT FUNDING	<u>19<del>19</del>17</u>
9	X. DESIGNATED PROJECT COORDINATORS	18
10	XI. PERFORMANCE	19
1	XII. CERTIFICATION OF EHA	19
	XIII. TRANSFER OF INTEREST IN PROPERTY	<u>21<del>21</del>19</u>
12	XIV. AMENDMENT OF CONSENT DECREE	20
13	XV. DISPUTE RESOLUTION	
	XVI. CONTRIBUTION PROTECTION	
14	XVII. COVENANT NOT TO SUE UNDER MTCA; REOPENERS	22
15	XVIII. DISCLAIMER	
16	XIX. RETENTION OF RECORDS	
10	XX. ACCESS	
17	XXI. COMPLIANCE WITH OTHER APPLICABLE LAWS	
18	XXII. SAMPLING, DATA REPORTING, AND AVAILABILITY	
	XXIII. PROGRESS REPORTS	
19	XXIV. EXTENSION OF SCHEDULE	
20	XXV. ENDANGERMENT	
21	XXVI. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	<u>22<del>32</del>30</u>
_1	XXVII. DURATION OF DECREE AND RETENTION OF JURISDICTION;	222221
22	CERTIFICATIONS BY ECOLOGY	
23	XXVIII. WITHDRAWAL OF CONSENT	
	XXIX. IMPLEMENTATION OF REMEDIAL ACTION	
24	XXX. INDEMNIFICATION	
25	XXXI. CLAIMS AGAINST THE STATE	
26	XXXII. SEVERABILITY	
ا ۵۷	XXXIII. EFFECTIVE DATE	
	PROSPECTIVE PURCHASER CONSENT DECREE RE: EVERETT SMFLTER FENCED AREA, EVERETT, WASHINGTON - i	
В	I SMIPLIPK PENUED AKEA, EVEKELL, WASHINGION "I	

### **EXHIBITS**

3	EXHIBIT A.	Legal Description of Asarco Property
	EXHIBIT B.	Maps depicting the Everett Smelter Site and relevant portions thereof
1	EXHIBIT C.	Cleanup Action Plan (FCAP/FEIS)
	EXHIBIT D.	Restrictive Covenant 1 and 2
5	EXHIBIT E.	Public Participation Plan
	EXHIBIT F.	Proposed Schedule
5	EXHIBIT G.	Interim Action Report and Final Design Report
		Letter from EHA to Ecology asserting Innocent Purchaser Defense
7	EXHIBIT H. EXHIBIT I.	Letter from Ecology to City of Everett re: City's role in supporting EHA's
		property purchase
}		

PROSPECTIVE PURCHASER CONSENT DECREE RE: EVERETT SMELTER FENCED AREA, EVERETT, WASHINGTON - ii

#### I. INTRODUCTION

A. This prospective purchaser consent decree ("Decree") is made and entered into by and between the Washington State Department of Ecology ("Ecology") and the Housing Authority of the City of Everett ("EHA").

B. The purpose of this Decree is to (1) resolve the potential liability of EHA for contamination of soil, groundwater and surface water at the Everett Smelter Site (Site) arising from releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances associated with the historic operation of the Everett Smelter; (2) to promote the public interest by providing for remedial action at one portion of the Site known as the "Fenced Area"; and (3) to facilitate the cleanup and redevelopment of contaminated residential land in Everett, Washington, within the "Fenced Area." The Fenced Area includes both streets and other public rights of way (the "Public Property"), and 22 vacant residential-zoned tracts of real property (the "Asarco Property"). A legal description of the Asarco Property is attached as Exhibit A. Maps of the Site that depict the extent of the Site plus relevant portions of the Site such as the Fenced Area, are attached as Exhibit B.

C. EHA is entering into a Purchase and Sale Agreement (the "Agreement") to purchase the Asarco Property from Domestic Realty Company, a wholly-owned subsidiary of ASARCO Incorporated, a New Jersey Corporation ("Asarco"), current owner of the Asarco Property. EHA anticipates that it will also seek vacation of some or all of the Public Property, and will hold title to the Public Property until new streets are created and dedicated to the City of Everett.

D. EHA proposes to perform a partial cleanup of the Site, by completing clean up of one portion of the Site, the Fenced Area, and making the Fenced Area available for <u>single family or other</u> residential development, consistent with applicable City of Everett zoning provisions and comprehensive plan designations <u>as those designations may be revised</u>. EHA's proposed completion of cleanup for the Fenced Area will occur subsequent to remediation of

the Fenced Area by removal of all material with arsenic concentrations exceeding 3,000 mg/kg, which will be performed by Asarco outside the terms of this Decree and which will serve as a precondition of EHA's purchase of the Asarco Property.

- E. In the absence of this Decree, at the time it acquires an interest in the Fenced Area, EHA would incur potential liability under RCW 70.105D.040(1)(a) of the Model Toxics Control Act ("MTCA") for performing remedial actions, or for paying remedial costs incurred by Ecology, resulting from past releases or threatened releases of hazardous substances at the Site.
- F. Ecology has identified confirmed or suspected contamination in soil, groundwater, and surface water at the Site. Ecology has assigned the Site an overall priority ranking of 1 pursuant to MTCA.
- G. Asarco has performed a Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study ("RI/FS") (1995) and other sampling efforts and studies, which confirmed that environmental media at the upland area of the Site contain concentrations of hazardous substances above applicable MTCA cleanup levels, and which characterized the upland area of the Site adequately for cleanup activities. The upland area of the Site includes the Fenced Area.
- H. Ecology has approved an Integrated Final Cleanup Action Plan (1999), as amended (2002) ("FCAP/FEIS"), attached to this Decree as Exhibit C. Ecology has also approved an Interim Action Report and Final Design Report, both attached as Exhibit G. These documents provide for (1) removal of all material from the Fenced Area in excess of 3,000 mg/kg of arsenic, followed by (2) removal of all material from the Fenced Area between 150 and 3,000 mg/kg of arsenic and the placement of two a minimum of two feet of clean fill, and (3) compliance monitoring activities. As described in Section V (Statement of Facts), a subsequent enforcement order issued to Asarco (Enforcement Order No. 02TCPNR-4059) and an Agreed Judgment enforcing that order (Agreed Judgment Granting Relief to Enforce Order Pursuant to RCW 70.105D.050, Snohomish Cty. Sup. Ct. No. 03-2-08502-1, October 20, 2003)

("Agreed Judgment"), require partial implementation of FCAP/FEIS provisions. The application of MTCA cleanup and remediation levels as indicated in the FCAP/FEIS is appropriate under MTCA for <u>single family or other</u> residential redevelopment of the Fenced Area, the portion of the Site that is the subject of this Decree (as a result of the 2002 amendment of the FCAP/FEIS, the Restrictive Covenant(s) to be applied to property in the Fenced Area need not prohibit single family residential use).

- I. This Decree promotes the public interest by expediting cleanup activities at the Site and by facilitating the redevelopment and reuse of a portion of the Site (the Fenced Area) for single family or residential and/or related uses consistent with applicable zoning and comprehensive plan designations as those designations may be revised.
- J. EHA has offered to further certain Ecology goals as provided in this Decree, in exchange for a covenant not to sue and protection from contribution under MTCA. Among other things, subsequent to purchasing the Asarco Property, EHA will complete cleanup of the the Fenced Area as specified in the FCAP/FEIS. EHA will not be responsible under the terms of this Decree for conducting remedial actions at the Site outside the Fenced Area which the FCAP/FEIS and associated cleanup documents would otherwise require be done outside the Fenced Area, including but not limited to the required monitoring of ground water and surface water outside the Fenced Area.
- K. Plans for the redevelopment of the Fenced Area are not likely to aggravate or contribute to contamination at the Site, interfere with remedial actions that may be needed on the Site, or increase human health risks to persons at or in the vicinity of the Site.
- L. This Decree will provide a substantial public benefit by promoting the cleanup, redevelopment, and active reuse of contaminated and partially vacant urban residential property and providing affordable housing and substantial community and economic benefits to the area.
- M. The Complaint in this action is being filed simultaneously with this Decree. An answer has not been filed, and there has not been a trial on any issue of fact or law in this case.

However, the Parties wish to resolve the issues raised by Ecology's Complaint. In addition, the Parties agree that settlement of these matters without litigation is reasonable and in the public interest and that entry of this Decree is the most appropriate means of resolving these matters.

- N. By entering into this Decree, the Parties do not intend to discharge nonsettling parties from any liability they may have with respect to matters alleged in the Complaint. The Parties retain the right to seek reimbursement, in whole or in part, from any liable persons for sums expended under this Decree.
- O. This Decree shall not be construed as proof of EHA liability or responsibility for any releases of hazardous substances or cost for remedial action nor an admission of any facts; provided, however, that EHA shall not challenge the jurisdiction of Ecology in any proceeding to enforce this Decree.
- P. The Court is fully advised of the reasons for entry of this Decree, and good cause having been shown:

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED, AND DECREED AS FOLLOWS:

### II. JURISDICTION

- A. This Court has jurisdiction over the subject matter and over the Parties pursuant to MTCA, Chapter 70.105D RCW. Venue is proper in Snohomish County pursuant to RCW 70.105D.050(5)(b).
- B. Authority is conferred upon the Washington State Attorney General by RCW 70.105D.040(4)(a) and 70.105D.040(5) to agree to a settlement with any potentially liable person ("PLP") if, after public notice and any required hearing, Ecology finds the proposed settlement would lead to a more expeditious cleanup of hazardous substances. In addition, the Attorney General may agree to a settlement with a person not currently liable for remedial action at a facility who proposes to purchase, redevelop, or reuse the facility, provided that the settlement will yield substantial new resources to facilitate cleanup, the settlement will expedite remedial action consistent with the rules adopted under MTCA, and Ecology determines based

upon available information that the redevelopment or reuse of the facility is not likely to contribute to the existing release or threatened release, interfere with remedial actions that may be needed at the site, or increase health risks to persons at or in the vicinity of the site. RCW 70.105D.040(4)(b) requires that such a settlement be entered as a consent decree issued by a court of competent jurisdiction.

- C. Ecology has determined that a release or threatened release of hazardous substances has occurred at the Site.
- D. EHA currently owns a number of properties that are located within the Site's boundaries, as outlined in Exhibit H to this Decree. Given the unique circumstances and all information presented by EHA to Ecology in Exhibit H, however, Ecology has determined under RCW 70.105D.040(3)(b) that EHA innocently purchased such properties and is not currently liable for the Site under RCW 70.105D.040(1)(a) by virtue of owning such properties. EHA certifies that it does not currently own any other interest in the Site, except as contemplated by paragraph E of this Section, below.
- E. EHA and Asarco are negotiating a Purchase and Sale Agreement for a separate portion of property at the Site, the Asarco Houses. At the time EHA acquires an interest in the Fenced Area, EHA will have previously acquired the Asarco Houses and settled through a separate Prospective Purchaser Consent Decree (the "Asarco Houses Consent Decree") the liability for the Site that would otherwise be incurred at the time it acquires the Asarco Houses.
- F. Ecology has not determined that EHA is a PLP for the Site, and EHA has certified under Section XII (Certification) that it is not otherwise currently liable with respect to the Site under Chapter 70.105D RCW, and pursuant to paragraphs D and E of this Section.
- G. Were EHA to acquire any interest in property at the Site in addition to the separate interests owned by EHA and as described in paragraphs D and E of this Section, it could become a PLP as an owner or operator under RCW 70.105D.040(1)(a). This Decree is entered prior to EHA acquisition of any interest in the Fenced Area in order to resolve EHA's

23 | 24 |

liability for the Site that would otherwise be incurred through EHA's acquisition of an interest in the Fenced Area, and to facilitate a more expeditious cleanup at the Site than otherwise would occur. This Decree is entered pursuant to the authority set forth in RCW 70.105D.040(5).

- H. This Decree has been subject to public notice and comment.
- I. This Decree will yield substantial new resources to facilitate cleanup, and will expedite remedial action consistent with Chapter 173-340 WAC. Based on available information, Ecology has determined that the redevelopment or reuse of the facility will provide a substantial public benefit and is not likely to contribute to the existing release or threatened release, interfere with remedial actions that may be needed at the Site, or increase health risks to persons at or in the vicinity of the Site.

### III. PARTIES BOUND

This Decree shall apply to and be binding upon the Parties to this Decree, their successors and assigns. The undersigned representative of each party hereby certifies that he or she is fully authorized to enter into this Decree and to execute and legally bind such party to comply with the Decree. EHA agrees to undertake all actions required by the terms and conditions of this Decree and not to contest state jurisdiction regarding this Decree. No change in ownership or corporate status shall alter EHA's responsibility under this Decree. EHA shall provide a copy of this Decree to Asarco and all agents, contractors, and subcontractors retained to perform work required by this Decree, and shall ensure that all work undertaken by such agents, contractors, and subcontractors complies with this Decree.

#### IV. DEFINITIONS

Except as specified herein, all definitions in RCW 70.105D.020 and WAC 173-340-200 apply to the terms of this Decree.

"Asarco Houses" shall mean the 15 residential properties, lying outside of the Fenced Area, with existing single-family and duplex houses, located north of Butler Street on Hawthorne Street, Pilchuck Path and East Marine View Drive, as shown in Exhibit B.

"Asarco Houses Consent Decree" shall mean the Prospective Purchaser Consent Decree entered into by EHA to resolve the liability for contamination at the Site that EHA would otherwise incur by purchasing the Asarco Houses.

"Asarco Property" shall mean the 22 residential-zoned tracts of real property that are located within the "Fenced Area," as legally described in Exhibit A and shown in Exhibit B.

"Consent Decree" or "Decree" shall mean this Decree and each of the Exhibits to the Decree. All exhibits are integral and enforceable parts of this Decree.

"Fenced Area" refers to the Former Arsenic Trioxide Processing Area as shown in Figure 1-2 of the FCAP/FEIS, Exhibit C, and in Exhibit B. The Fenced Area comprises one portion of the Site, and includes 22 residential-zoned tracts of real property ("Asarco Property") along with streets and other public rights of way ("Public Property"), generally located south of North Broadway (SR 529), east of Hawthorne Street, west of East Marine View Drive and north of Butler street, upon which the residential structures and improvements have been demolished and are now surrounded by security fencing.

"Final Design Report" shall mean the *Final Design Report, Everett Smelter Site*, 2004, attached as Exhibit G (Exhibit G also includes the Interim Action Report), and incorporated by reference herein.

"Integrated Final Cleanup Action Plan" and "FCAP/FEIS" shall mean the combined Integrated Final Cleanup Action Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Upland Area, November 19, 1999, as amended, attached as Exhibit C, and incorporated by reference herein.

"Interim Action Report" shall mean the *Interim Action Report, Fenced Area Cleanup, Everett Smelter Site*, 2002, attached as Exhibit G (Exhibit G also includes the Final Design Report), and incorporated by reference herein.—

"Parties" refers to the Washington State Department of Ecology ("Ecology") and the Housing Authority of the City of Everett ("EHA").

"Peripheral Area" shall mean that portion of the upland area of the Site, as shown in Figure 1-2 of the FCAP/FEIS, Exhibit C, and in Exhibit B, which is outside of the Fenced Area.

"Public Property" shall mean the public streets and other public rights of way that are located within the "Fenced Area," as shown in Exhibit B.

"Asarco Tacoma Smelter" shall mean the portion of the Commencement Bay Near Shore Tideflats Superfund site which is Asarco's former Tacoma Smelter, Ruston Way and North 51st Street, Tacoma, WA 98407, EPA ID WAD980726368.

"Section" shall mean a portion of this Decree identified by a Roman numeral and including one or more paragraphs.

"Site" shall mean the Everett Smelter Site located in Everett, Washington. The Site is defined by the extent of contamination caused by the release or threatened release of hazardous substances at the Site. The Site is generally located in northeast Everett and is more particularly described in Exhibit B to this Decree, which is a detailed Site diagram. The Site includes as one portion the Fenced Area, and as another portion, the Asarco Houses. The Site constitutes a Facility under RCW 70.105D.020(4).

"Successors in Interest and Assign" or "successors and assigns" shall mean any person who acquires an interest in the Fenced Area subsequent to EHA acquiring an interest in the Fenced Area, through purchase, lease, transfer, assignment, or otherwise.

### V. STATEMENT OF FACTS

Ecology makes the following findings of fact:

- 1. The Site is located in Everett, Washington, and consists of approximately 686 acres. The Fenced Area constitutes a portion of the Site and approximately 5 acres. Maps of the Site, which depict the extent of the Site plus relevant portions of the Site including the Fenced Area, Asarco Houses, Asarco Property, and Public Property, are attached as Exhibit B.
- 2. The Everett Smelter Site previously hosted a smelter plant that, at the turn of the last century, was one of the largest industrial facilities in Everett. In 1894, the Puget Sound

Reduction Company began operating the smelter, refining ores primarily from the Monte Cristo mining district. Some of the ore from the Monte Cristo mining district contained over 25 percent total arsenic. To recover arsenic from the ore, an arsenic processing plant was constructed on the southern end of the Everett Smelter Site. The plant consisted of several structures, including additional smoke stacks, flues, ovens and mills, and a large arsenic processing building.

- 3. In 1903, a corporation that subsequently became ASARCO Incorporated ("Asarco") bought and continued operating the smelter. Asarco subsequently dismantled the smelter in 1914 and 1915.
- 4. Asarco sold the smelter and its surrounding land-holdings through a series of transactions between 1914 and 1936 to different buyers, including the Weyerhaeuser Company ("Weyerhaeuser"), the State of Washington Department of Transportation, the City of Everett and Burlington Northern. In addition, 17.89 acres were purchased and subsequently developed into residential neighborhoods. About 25 houses were built on property that is now within the Fenced Area.
- 5. During an environmental investigation in 1990, Weyerhaeuser discovered an outcrop of slag discovered on the hillside below East Marine View Drive. As part of the investigation, slag, soil, and ground water samples were collected on Weyerhaeuser property and analyzed for the presence of heavy metals. After receiving the data, Weyerhaeuser notified Ecology that a release of a hazardous substance had occurred at the Everett Smelter Site.
- 6. Ecology conducted an initial investigation of the Smelter Site in December 1990. The investigation included a site visit, historic research of the area, and a review of the data previously submitted by Weyerhaeuser.
- 7. Ecology conducted a Site Hazard Assessment (SHA) of the Smelter Site in February 1991. The SHA consisted of a magnetic survey, to attempt to locate the extent of buried slag, and collection of 20 surface soil samples that were analyzed for metals. Laboratory

analysis demonstrated releases of arsenic, cadmium, and lead to the soils found in the residential area on the site.

- 8. Ecology conducted a "Pre-Remedial Investigation" (Pre-RI) in May 1991. The Pre-RI consisted of the preparation of a site map and collection of additional soil samples. The purpose of the investigation was to further characterize the nature and extent of elevated concentrations of residual metals that were identified in the SHA. Results of the Pre-RI confirmed releases of arsenic, cadmium, and lead in surface soils throughout the study area.
- 9. By letter dated August 29, 1991, Ecology notified Asarco of its status as a "potentially liable person" under RCW 70.105D.040 after notice and opportunity for comment.
- 10. In April 1992 Ecology issued Enforcement Order No. DE92TC-N147 to Asarco. This Order required Asarco to perform a Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study and certain Interim Actions to limit exposure of residents to arsenic and other metals at the Smelter Site.
- 11. In March 1994, Ecology issued the first amendment to Enforcement Order No. DE92TC-N147. The first amendment required Asarco to perform additional interim actions and prepare an interim deliverable remedial investigation report. The amendment also required Asarco to undertake additional sampling for the remedial investigation and extended the schedule.
- 12. In 1994 and 1995, Asarco voluntarily implemented a property buy-out program for the homes located in the Fenced Area. All but two of the homes were purchased as part of this program.
- 13. In September 1995 Ecology issued Enforcement Order No. DE95TC-N350 to Asarco. This Order required Asarco to immediately take action to stop the exposure to arsenic of residents, pets, and others who resided in the two remaining houses at 520 and 534 East Marine View Drive, within the Fenced Area. Thereafter, Asarco purchased these properties and the families vacated them.

- 14. Pursuant to Enforcement Order DE92TC-N147, Asarco prepared an Interim Deliverable report in April 1994 and a Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study (RI/FS) report (Everett Smelter Remedial Investigation and Feasibility Study, prepared by Hydrometrics, Inc. for Asarco Inc. and dated September 1995) for most of the study area.
- 15. Based on analytical data in the RI/FS report, there is evidence of arsenic and lead in ground water and arsenic and lead in surface water on the Site. Based on other analytical data collected, there is evidence of arsenic and lead in house dust on the Site.
- DE95TC-N350 Asarco expanded its property buy-out program and purchased all but fifteen of the residences in the area south of Broadway, east of Balsam Lane, north of Butler Street, and west of East Marine View Drive. Since Asarco's purchase, all of the homes located within the Fenced Area have been vacated and demolished. Many of the homes adjacent to the Fenced Area have also been vacated, although Asarco is currently leasing some of these properties, known as the Asarco Houses, for residential use.
- Action Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement for one portion of the Everett Smelter Site (FCAP/FEIS) on November 19, 1999. The FCAP/FEIS required, among other things, that all material within the Fenced Area with an arsenic concentration greater than 3,000 milligrams/kilogram (mg/kg, equivalent to parts per million) be excavated and sent off-site to a facility permitted to accept such waste. This requirement was based on concern over leaving high levels of contamination in an urban neighborhood that, if exposed, could constitute an immediate threat to human health.
- 18. As documented in the RI/FS and FCAP/FEIS, the remedial action to be implemented pursuant to this Decree will achieve partial cleanup of the Site by achieving cleanup standards for one portion of the Site, the Fenced Area. The remedial action to be implemented under the FCAP/FEIS includes (1) removal of all material from the Fenced Area

in excess of 3,000 mg/kg of arsenic, followed by (2) removal of all material from the Fenced Area between 150 and 3,000 mg/kg of arsenic and the placement of two a minimum of two feet of clean fill, and (3) compliance monitoring activities. Because treatment, excavation, disposal, and/or recycling of all hazardous substances at this portion of the Site is not practicable, the remedy for the Fenced Area of the Site includes elements of on-site containment, through on-site capping, as set forth in the FCAP/FEIS. The remedy therefore includes monitoring and institutional controls.

- 19. In January 2000 Asarco issued the draft Comprehensive Lowland Area Remedial Investigation Report (LL Report). Asarco's report concluded that it is likely that remediation activities planned for the Fenced Area would be successful in intercepting and removing current sources of metals to ground water and surface water. Asarco's report found that the best approach for addressing elevated arsenic concentrations was to begin with the Fenced Area.
- 20. On June 10, 2002, Ecology issued Enforcement Order No. 02TCPNR-4059 to Asarco. Enforcement Order No. 02TCPNR-4059 required Asarco to perform an interim action to remove the most contaminated material within the Fenced Area, consisting of arsenic concentrations exceeding 3,000 mg/kg. Specifically, the enforcement order required Asarco to excavate and send to an off-site facility all flue dust, arsenic trioxide, soil, and any other material with an arsenic concentration exceeding 3,000 mg/kg.
- 21. Ecology amended Enforcement Order No. 02TCPNR-4059 in December of 2002, to require Asarco to include removal of material outside of the Fenced Area with arsenic concentrations exceeding 3,000 mg/kg. The material outside the Fenced Area that is known to have concentrations exceeding the 3,000 mg/kg limit is located along East Marine View Drive.
- 22. Enforcement Order No. 02TCPNR-4059 required Asarco to submit a work plan for accomplishing the required cleanup work. Asarco submitted a draft work plan in December 2002. The work plan proposed accomplishing the required work in 2003 and 2004, but

acknowledged that delay of removal of material until 2004 would violate the Order. Asarco's work plan indicated Asarco intended to send excavated material to its Asarco Tacoma Smelter, but contained a contingency plan for actions to implement if the material could not be sent to the Asarco Tacoma Smelter.

- 23. In a letter dated March 18, 2003, Ecology approved Asarco's December 2002 draft work plan.
- 24. On June 20, 2003, after correspondence established Asarco's inability to meet the April 30, 2003 mobilization date stated in Enforcement Order No. 02TCPNR-4059, Ecology filed suit in Snohomish County Superior Court. The suit sought injunctive relief to cause Asarco to come into compliance with Enforcement Order No. 02TCPNR-4059, and adhere to the schedule which had been set out in the Ecology approved December 2002 work plan.
- 25. On October 20, 2003, the Court entered an Agreed Judgment requiring Asarco to come into compliance with Enforcement Order No. 02TCPNR-4059 and to comply with an agreed schedule/timeline to achieve final removal of material with arsenic concentrations exceeding 3,000 mg/kg by October 31, 2004 and to submit to Ecology a draft As-Built Report documenting such removal by December 31, 2004.
- 26. On December 1, 2003, EHA and Asarco entered into an Option to Purchase (the "Option") the Asarco Property and the Asarco Houses, with an Option term of 120 days, which has been extended to 150 days.
- 27. The City of Everett has conducted land use planning under Ch. 36.70A RCW, and the Site is designated 1.3, Single Family Residential, by the Everett Comprehensive Plan. The Site has been used for residential purposes and is zoned R-2, single family medium density residential. Any hazardous substances in soil that may remain on portions of the Fenced Area after the remedial action has been completed pursuant to this Decree will not pose a threat to human health and the environment. In order to enable the work in this Decree to proceed, the City of Everett has agreed to take certain actions, including guaranteeing an EHA loan, granting

EHA powers as a community renewal agency, and abandoning certain rights of way and utilities. In a letter dated May 18, 2004, which is attached as Exhibit I to this Decree and incorporated herein by reference, Ecology has confirmed to the City that it does not consider the City to be acquiring liability under MTCA for its role in supporting EHA's purchase and cleanup of these properties.

28. EHA intends to facilitate the redevelopment of the Fenced Area portion of the Site for <u>single family or other</u> residential purposes consistent with applicable City of Everett comprehensive plan designations and zoning regulations as those designations may be revised. EHA intends, as necessary, to seek comprehensive plan and zoning changes to permit higher density residential development than may be allowed under current designations and regulations.

### VI. DESCRIPTION OF PLANNED PROJECT

EHA proposes to acquire the Asarco Property through purchase pursuant to a purchase and sale agreement that is currently being negotiated. The sale is expected to close on or before September, 2004.

EHA proposes to perform a partial cleanup of the Site by completing the cleanup of the Fenced Area as described in this Decree, and to facilitate the redevelopment of the Fenced Area for single family or other residential uses, consistent with the City of Everett's zoning and comprehensive plan designations for the Site as those designations may be revised. EHA expects that Asarco will utilize, inter alia, sale proceeds from EHA's purchase of the Asarco Houses under a separate purchase agreement, and matching funds from an Environmental Trust Fund administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, to remediate the Fenced Area plus an additional adjacent area, by removing material with arsenic concentrations exceeding 3,000 mg/kg, in accordance with the Agreed Judgment. EHA shall then, upon purchase of the Asarco Property, complete the cleanup of the Fenced Area of the Site in accordance with the Scope of Work set forth herein (FCAP/FEIS, Exhibit C, and the Interim Action Report and

Final Design Report, Exhibit G) and with the Schedule (Exhibit F) set forth herein, including but not limited to: removal of material within the Fenced Area with concentrations between 150 and 3,000 mg/kg, regrading of the Fenced Area, placement of a marker fabric and a minimum of two feet of clean fill over contaminated soil, and implementation of required monitoring and institutional controls within the Fenced Area.

The placement date (not to exceed June 2006) and the specifications for the minimum of two feet of clean fill shall be established in the Site Restoration Plan as approved by Ecology (or an Interim Site Restoration Plan, if one is prepared, as approved by Ecology). Unless otherwise approved by Ecology in the Site Restoration Plan: (1) the minimum of two feet of clean fill shall be topsoil that is either not contaminated with hazardous substances, or that both meets MTCA unrestricted land use soil cleanup levels and constitutes "clean soil" as defined in WAC 173-350-100 and is suitable to support lawns or other vegetation typical of single family residential use; and (2) the cap shall be placed and hydroseeded by October 31, 2004 if possible, but in any event not later than September 1, 2005. If the City of Everett has approved redevelopment project plans for the Fenced Area prior to capping and the City approves of a delay, then Ecology may agree to delay completion of the capping until June 2006.

The minimum of two feet of clean soil will be used for landscaping and other activities consistent with the residential use of the Fenced Area portion of the Site. Controlled disturbance or modification of the cap as required for site redevelopment activities, including potential short-term exposure of soils beneath the capping layer necessary for the installation of fence posts and/or modification of the cap elevations and contours, is allowable provided such disturbance is performed in accordance with the Restrictive Covenants (Exhibit D).

The proposal will ensure the cleanup of approximately 5 acres of land and mitigate existing exposure pathways at the Fenced Area.

Ecology has complied with the State Environmental Policy Act ("SEPA") environmental review requirements for the proposed remedial actions to be performed. Ecology has been

established as the agency lead pursuant to SEPA. The SEPA Final Environmental Impact Statement for the planned remedial actions is integrated with the Final Cleanup Action Plan dated November 19, 1999, as amended (FCAP/FEIS) and is attached as Exhibit C.

### VII. WORK TO BE PERFORMED

This Decree contains a program designed to protect human health and the environment at the Fenced Area of the Site from the known release, or threatened release, of hazardous substances or contaminants at, on, or from the sSite.

### A. Scope of Work

The Scope of Work requires EHA to implement the Interim Action Report and Final Design Report, Exhibit G, according to the Schedule as set forth herein and contained in Exhibit F, except that EHA will not be responsible for removing the material exceeding 3000 mg/kg arsenic.—With respect to the compliance monitoring requirements set forth in the Compliance Monitoring Plan, incorporated as Appendix A into both the Interim Action Report and the Final Design Report (Exhibit G), EHA and its successors and assigns shall be responsible under this Consent Decree for implementing theall requirements of the Compliance Monitoring Plan applicable to soils in the Fenced Area, including but but shall not limited to soilbe responsible for -implementing monitoring requirements at the Site outside of the Fenced Area, including groundwater, surface water and storm drain sediment monitoring and (except—those requirements applying to soil in the peripheral area Peripheral Area and import material placed in the peripheral area Peripheral Area.

EHA expects that prior to the Effective Date of this Decree and as a precondition to EHA's purchase of the Asarco Property, Asarco will utilize, <u>inter alia</u>, sale proceeds from EHA's previous purchase of the Asarco Houses and matching funds from an Environmental Trust Fund administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency to implement the remediation specified in the Agreed Judgment, including all attachments thereto, and work plans prepared thereunder, according to the schedules provided therein. Clean up activities to

be performed by Asarco will include removal of all material from the Site in excess of 3,000 mg/kg of arsenic.

Pursuant to this Decree, EHA shall implement a remedial action to remove all material from the Fenced Area between 150 and 3,000 mg/kg of arsenic, regrade, cap, perform compliance monitoring, and perform other work as required by the FCAP/FEIS, the Interim Action Report and the Final Design Report, including but not limited to preparation of the Landscape Buffer Plan and Final Site Restoration Plan. EHA's responsibility for remedial action at the Site is confined by the terms of this Decree to the Fenced Area.

The contaminated soils from the Fenced Area shall be disposed of at the Asarco Tacoma Smelter. EHA may request an extension of schedule based upon good cause, pursuant to Section XXIV (Extension of Schedule), if the Asarco Tacoma Smelter becomes unavailable for disposal of materials from the Fenced Area as required by this Decree. Coordination of cleanup and development will minimize disruption to the surrounding community. Ecology has reviewed and approved the proposed methods for transportation and disposal as described in the Final Design Report.

EHA shall provide security at the Fenced Area designed to prevent entry by exposure of unauthorized persons to contaminated soils. Security measures shall be maintained during the implementation of the remediation activities required by duration of this Decree, unless otherwise agreed to by Ecology.

Completion of remediation for any parcel may be certified by Ecology after receipt of all validated performance monitoring data and pursuant to Section XXVII (Certifications by Ecology).

Because residual concentrations of hazardous substances in groundwater at the Site will exceed cleanup levels following completion of the remedial action, and because residual concentrations of hazardous substances in soils at certain parcels of the Fenced Area may exceed cleanup levels following completion of the remedial action, EHA shall either: (1) record

Restrictive Covenant 1 shown in Exhibit D for parcels on which soil contamination remains or (2) record Restrictive Covenant 2 shown in Exhibit D for parcels where no soil contamination remains. EHA must seek Ecology's prior written approval before filing a Restrictive Covenant for any parcel within ten (10) days of the completion of the remedial action for that parcel or for the Fenced Area as a whole. EHA shall then file the Restrictive Covenant with the Snohomish County Auditor's Office within ten (10) days of receiving Ecology's written approval, and shall then provide Ecology with a copy of each recorded Restrictive Covenant within thirty (30) days of the recording date. If associated replatting of any such parcels will occur within an expected timeframe and no activities conducted at the parcels in question will threaten the integrity of the remedial action or the continued protection of human health and the environment in the interim, EHA may extend the timeline for seeking Ecology's written approval of the Restrictive Covenant for the parcel in question to within ten (10) days of any associated replatting, and the timeline for filing such Restrictive Covenant will be extended to within ten (10) days of EHA's receipt of Ecology's written approval. If at any point in the future the conditions requiring a restrictive covenant for any parcel under this Section no longer exist, then EHA, or its Successors in Interest and Assigns, may submit a request to Ecology that the restrictive covenant be eliminated. The restrictive covenant shall be removed, if Ecology, after public notice and opportunity to comment, concurs.

### B. Schedule for Work

The Schedule for Work is set forth in Exhibit F.

C. EHA agrees not to perform any remedial actions outside the scope of this Decree unless approved in writing by Ecology. All work conducted by EHA under this Decree shall be done in accordance with Chapter 173-340 WAC unless otherwise provided herein.

25

24

EHA agrees to pay costs incurred by Ecology pursuant to this Decree and consistent with WAC 173-340-550(2). These costs shall include work performed by Ecology or its contractors for, or on, the Fenced Area of the Site under Ch. 70.105D RCW both prior to and subsequent to the issuance of this Decree for investigations, remedial actions, and Decree preparation, negotiations, oversight, and administration relating to work that is required by this Decree. Ecology costs shall include costs of direct activities and the support costs of direct activities as defined in WAC 173-340-550(2). EHA agrees to pay the required amount within ninety (90) days of receiving from Ecology an itemized statement of costs that includes a summary of costs incurred, an identification of involved staff, and the amount of time spent by involved staff members on the project, unless Ecology agrees in writing and in advance to an extended schedule for payment. A general statement of work performed will be provided upon request. Itemized statements shall be prepared quarterly. Failure to pay Ecology's costs within ninety (90) days of receipt of the itemized statement will resullt in interest charges pursuant to WAC 173-340-550(4), unless Ecology agrees in writing and in advance to an extended payment schedule.

#### IX. GRANT FUNDING

Pursuant to RCW 70.105D.070(3)(a) and Chapter 173-322 WAC, Ecology has made the following determinations: (a) EHA is a local government required, pursuant to this Decree, to undertake remedial action at the Site; and (b) EHA is prepared to proceed promptly to accomplish the remediation set forth in Section VII (Work to Be Performed) and expenses incurred in implementing the work to be performed, hereunder are eligible for a local government grant; and (c) implementation of this Decree will lead to a more expeditious cleanup of hazardous substances at the Site in compliance with cleanup standards adopted under RCW 70.105D.030(2)(e).

2

3

4

5

6

7

•

8

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

2425

26

David L. South Department of Ecology 3190 160<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE Bellevue, WA 98008 Telephone: (425-649-7200)

The project coordinator for Ecology is:

The project coordinator for EHA is:

Mr. Bud Alkire Executive Director The Housing Authority of the City of Everett P.O. Box 1547, Everett, WA 98206-1547 Telephone: (425) 303-1102

Each project coordinator shall be responsible for overseeing the implementation of this Decree. The Ecology project coordinator will be Ecology's designated representative at the Site. To the maximum extent possible, communications between Ecology and EHA, and all documents, including reports, approvals, and other correspondence concerning the activities performed pursuant to the terms and conditions of this Decree shall be directed through the project coordinators. The project coordinators may designate, in writing, working-level staff contacts for all or portions of the implementation of the work required by this Decree. The project coordinators may agree to minor changes to the work to be performed without formal amendments to this Decree. Minor changes will be documented in writing by Ecology. Substantial changes shall require amendment of this Consent Decree.

Any party may change its respective project coordinator. Written notification shall be given to the other party at least ten (10) calendar days prior to the change.

#### XI. PERFORMANCE

All work performed pursuant to this Decree shall be under the direction and supervision, as necessary, of a professional engineer or hydrogeologist, or equivalent, with experience and expertise in hazardous waste site investigation and cleanup. All construction and engineering

PROSPECTIVE PURCHASER CONSENT DECREE RE: EVERETT SMELTER FENCED AREA, EVERETT, WASHINGTON - 20

20° 

work performed pursuant to this Decree must be under the supervision of a professional engineer. EHA shall notify Ecology in writing of the identity of such engineer(s) or hydrogeologist(s), or others, and of any contractors and subcontractors to be used in carrying out the terms of this Decree, in advance of their involvement at the Site.

#### XII. CERTIFICATION OF EHA

EHA represents and certifies that, to the best of its knowledge and belief, it has fully and accurately disclosed to Ecology the information currently in its possession or control that relates to the environmental conditions at and in the vicinity of the Site, or to EHA's right and title thereto.

EHA represents and certifies that it did not cause or contribute to a release or threatened release of hazardous substances at the Site and is not otherwise potentially liable under RCW 70.105D.040(1), pursuant to paragraph D of Section II (Jurisdiction), except as provided in the Asarco Houses Decree, and except by becoming an owner and/or operator of the Site by acquiring an interest in the Fenced Area.

### XIII. TRANSFER OF INTEREST IN PROPERTY

No voluntary conveyance or relinquishment of title, easement, leasehold, or other interest in any portion of the <u>Fenced Area of the Site shall</u> be consummated by EHA without provision for continued operation and maintenance of any containment system, treatment system, and/or monitoring system installed or implemented pursuant to this Decree.

Prior to EHA's transfer of any interest in all or any portion of <u>Fenced Area of</u> the Site, and during the effective period of this Decree, EHA shall serve a copy of this Decree upon any prospective purchaser, lessee, transferee, assignee, or other successor in said interest; and, at least thirty (30) days prior to any transfer, EHA shall notify Ecology of said transfer. Upon transfer of any interest, EHA shall restrict uses and activities to those consistent with this Consent Decree and notify the transferee(s) of the restrictions on the use of the property.

This Decree may only be amended by a written stipulation among the Parties that is entered by the Court, or by order of the Court. Such amendment shall become effective upon entry by the Court. Agreement to amend the Decree shall not be unreasonably withheld by any Party.

EHA shall submit any request for an amendment to Ecology for approval. Ecology shall indicate its approval or disapproval in a timely manner after the request for amendment is received. If the amendment to the Decree represents a substantial change, Ecology will provide public notice and opportunity for comment. Reasons for the disapproval of a proposed amendment to the Decree shall be stated in writing. If Ecology does not agree to any proposed amendment, the disagreement may be addressed through the dispute resolution procedures described in Section XV (Dispute Resolution).

#### XV. DISPUTE RESOLUTION

- A. In the event a dispute arises as to any approval, disapproval, proposed change, or other decision or action by Ecology's project coordinator, the Parties shall use the dispute resolution procedure set forth below.
- (1) Upon receipt of the Ecology project coordinator's decision, EHA shall have fourteen (14) days to notify Ecology's project coordinator of any objection to the decision.
- (2) The Parties' project coordinators shall then confer in an effort to resolve the dispute. If the project coordinators cannot resolve the dispute within fourteen (14) days, Ecology's project coordinator shall issue a written decision.
- (3) EHA may then request Ecology management review of the decision. This request shall be submitted in writing to the Toxics Cleanup Program Manager within seven (7) days of receipt of Ecology's project coordinator's written decision.
- (4) Ecology's Toxics Cleanup Program Manager shall conduct a review of the dispute and shall issue a written decision regarding the dispute within thirty (30) days of the

request for review by EHA. The Toxics Cleanup Program Manager's decision shall be Ecology's final decision on the disputed matter.

- B. If Ecology's final written decision is unacceptable to EHA, EHA has the right to submit the dispute to the Court for resolution. The Parties agree that one judge should retain jurisdiction over this case and shall, as necessary, resolve any dispute arising under this Decree. In the event EHA presents an issue to the Court for review, the Court shall review the action or decision of Ecology on the basis of whether such action or decision was arbitrary and capricious and render a decision based on such standard of review.
- C. The Parties agree to only utilize the dispute resolution process in good faith and to expedite, to the extent possible, the dispute resolution process whenever it is used. When either party uses the dispute resolution in bad faith or for purposes of delay, the other party may seek sanctions.

Implementation of these dispute resolution procedures shall not provide a basis for delay of any activities required in this Decree, unless Ecology agrees in writing to a schedule extension or the Court so orders.

### XVI. CONTRIBUTION PROTECTION

With regard to claims for contribution against EHA, the Parties agree that EHA is entitled to protection against claims for contribution for matters addressed in this Decree as provided by RCW 70.105D.040(4)(d).

For the purposes of this Section, "matters addressed" include all remedial actions taken or to be taken and all remedial action costs (including Ecology's oversight costs) incurred or to be incurred by Ecology or any other person with respect to the Site. This Contribution Protection does not protect EHA against claims for contribution or recovery of remedial action costs taken or to be taken by Ecology or any other person with respect to the Site, in the event

22

23

24

25 26

EHA incurs liability for the Site by acquiring any interest in the Site other than the Fenced Area as contemplated by this Decree, and EHA does not resolve such potential liability for the Site through a separate, valid consent decree.

# XVII. COVENANT NOT TO SUE; REOPENERS

Covenant Not to Sue: In consideration of EHA's compliance with the terms and Α. conditions of this Decree, Ecology covenants not to institute legal or administrative actions against EHA regarding the release or threatened release of hazardous substances at the Site covered by this Decree.

This Decree covers only the Everett Smelter Site, specifically identified in Exhibit B and those hazardous substances that Ecology knows are located at the Site as of the date of entry of this Decree. This Decree does not cover any other hazardous substance or area. Ecology retains all of its authority relative to any substance or area not covered by this Decree. In addition, this Covenant Not to Sue does not provide EHA protection from legal or administrative actions against EHA for the release or threatened release at the Site, in the event EHA incurs liability for the Site by acquiring any separate interest in the Site (other than the Fenced Area, as contemplated by this Decree), and EHA does not resolve such liability for the Site through a separate, valid consent decree.

This Covenant Not To Sue shall have no applicability whatsoever to:

- Criminal liability; (1)
- Liability for damages to natural resources; (2)
- Any Ecology action, including cost recovery, against potentially liable persons (3) not a party to this Decree.

If factors not known to Ecology at the time of entry of the settlement agreement are discovered and present a previously unknown threat to human health or the environment, and Ecology determines in light of this information that further remedial action is necessary at the Fenced Area of the Site to protect human health or the environment, the Court shall amend this covenant not to sue.

- B. Reopeners: Ecology specifically reserves the right to institute legal or administrative action against EHA to require it to perform additional remedial actions at the Fenced Area of the Site and to pursue appropriate cost recovery, pursuant to RCW 70.105D.050 under the following circumstances:
- (1) Upon EHA's failure to meet the requirements of this Decree, including but not limited to, failure of the remedial action to meet the cleanup standards identified in the FCAP/FEIS (Exhibit C); or
- (2) Upon Ecology's determination that action beyond the terms of this Decree is necessary to abate an imminent and substantial endangerment to human health or the environment; or
- (3) Upon the availability of new information regarding factors previously unknown to Ecology, including the nature or quantity or hazardous substances at the Site, and Ecology determines, in light of this information, that further remedial action is necessary at the Fenced Area of the Site to protect human health or the environment; or
- (4) Upon Ecology's determination that additional remedial actions are necessary to achieve cleanup standards for the Fenced Area of the Site within the reasonable restoration time frame set forth in the FCAP/FEIS.

C. Except in the case of an emergency, prior to instituting legal or administrative action against EHA pursuant to paragraph B. above, Ecology shall provide EHA with fifteen (15) calendar days notice of such action.

#### XVIII. DISCLAIMER

This Decree does not constitute a representation by Ecology that the Site is fit for any particular purpose.

### XIX. RETENTION OF RECORDS

During the pendency of this Decree and for ten (10) years from the date this Decree is no longer in effect as provided in Section XXVII (Duration of Decree), EHA shall preserve all records reports, documents, and underlying data in its possession relevant to the implementation of this Decree and shall insert a similar record retention requirement into all contracts with project contractors and subcontractors. Upon request of Ecology, EHA shall make all records available to Ecology and allow access for review within a reasonable period of time.

#### XX. ACCESS

Ecology or any Ecology authorized representative shall have full authority to enter and freely move about all property at the Site that EHA either owns, controls, or has access rights to at all reasonable times for the purposes of, *inter alia*: inspecting records, operation logs, and contracts related to the work being performed pursuant to this Decree; reviewing EHA's progress in carrying out the terms of this Decree; conducting such tests or collecting such samples as Ecology may deem necessary; using a camera, sound recording, or other documentary type equipment to record work done pursuant to this Decree; and verifying the datae submitted to Ecology by EHA. EHA shall make all reasonable efforts to secure access rights for those properties within the Site not owned or controlled by Defendant where remedial activities or investigations will be performed pursuant to this Decree. Ecology or any authorized representative shall give reasonable notice before entering any Site property owned

or controlled by EHA unless an emergency prevents such notice. All Parties who access the Site pursuant to this paragraph shall comply with the approved Health and Safety Plan in the Final Design Report, Exhibit G.

### XXI. COMPLIANCE WITH OTHER APPLICABLE LAWS

A. All actions carried out by EHA pursuant to this Decree shall be done in accordance with all applicable federal, state, and local requirements, including requirements to obtain necessary permits, except as provided in paragraph B of this Section.

B. Pursuant to RCW 70.105D.090(1), the substantive requirements of Chapters 70.94, 70.95, 70.105, 75.55, 90.48, and 90.58 RCW and of any laws requiring or authorizing local government permits or approvals for remedial action under this Decree that are known to be applicable at the time of entry of the Decree have been included in the FCAP/FEIS (Exhibit C), and/or the Interim Action Report and/or Final Design Report (Exhibit G), and are binding and enforceable requirements of the Decree.

EHA has a continuing obligation to determine whether additional permits or approvals addressed in RCW 70.105D.090(1) would otherwise be required for the remedial action under this Decree. In the event either EHA or Ecology determines that additional permits or approvals addressed in RCW 70.105D.090(1) would otherwise be required for the remedial action under this Decree, it shall promptly notify the other party of this determination. Ecology shall determine whether Ecology or EHA shall be responsible to contact the appropriate state and/or local agencies. If Ecology so requires, EHA shall promptly consult with the appropriate state and/or local agencies and provide Ecology with written documentation from those agencies of the substantive requirements those agencies believe are applicable to the remedial action. Ecology shall make the final determination on the additional substantive requirements that must be met by EHA and on how EHA must meet those requirements. Ecology shall inform EHA in writing of these requirements and EHA shall have the opportunity to comment on such requirements. Once established by Ecology, the additional requirements shall be enforceable

requirements of this Decree. EHA shall not begin or continue the remedial action potentially subject to the additional requirements until Ecology makes its final determination.

Ecology shall ensure that notice and opportunity for comment is provided to the public and appropriate agencies prior to establishing the substantive requirements under this Section.

C. Pursuant to RCW 70.105D.090(2), in the event that Ecology determines that the exemption from complying with the procedural requirements of the laws referenced in RCW 70.105D.090(1) would result in the loss of approval from a federal agency necessary for the state to administer any federal law, such exemption shall not apply and EHA shall comply with both the procedural and substantive requirements of the laws referenced in RCW 70.105D.090(1), including any requirements to obtain permits.

# XXII. SAMPLING, DATA REPORTING, AND AVAILABILITY

With respect to the implementation of this Decree, EHA shall make the results of all sampling, laboratory reports, and/or test results generated by it, or on its behalf available to Ecology and shall submit these results in accordance with Section XXIII (Progress Reports).

Ground water sampling shall be submitted to Ecology according to the requirements of WAC 173-340-840(5). These submittals shall be provided to Ecology in accordance with Section XXIII (Progress Reports). Such groundwater sampling will be submitted to Ecology in conjunction with the as built reports required by WAC 173-340-400(6)(b)(ii).

If requested by Ecology, EHA shall allow split or duplicate samples to be taken by Ecology and/or its authorized representative of any samples collected by EHA pursuant to the implementation of this Decree. EHA shall notify Ecology at least seven (7) working days in advance of any sample collection or work activity at the Site. Ecology shall, upon request, allow split or duplicate samples to be taken by EHA or its authorized representative, of any samples collected by Ecology pursuant to the implementation of this Decree, provided it does not interfere with the Ecology's sampling. Without limiting Ecology's rights under Section XX

(Access), Ecology shall endeavor to notify EHA at least five (5) working days prior to any sampling collection activity.

#### XXIII. PROGRESS REPORTS

EHA shall submit to Ecology written monthly progress reports that describe the actions taken during the previous month to implement the requirements of this Decree. The progress report shall include the following:

- A. A list of activities that have taken place at the Fenced Area pursuant to the terms of this Decree during the month;
- B. Detailed description of any deviations from required tasks not otherwise documented in project plans or amendment requests;
- C. Description of all deviations from the Schedule (Exhibit F) during the current month and any planned deviations in the upcoming month;
- D. For any deviations in schedule, a plan for recovering lost time and maintaining compliance with the schedule;
- E. All raw data (including laboratory analyses) received by EHA during the past month and an identification of the source of the sample; and
- F. A list of deliverables for the upcoming reporting period if different from the Schedule.

EHA may substitute project reports submitted by Asarco or EHA's agents, contractors or subcontractors for any EHA progress reports required under this Section, provided such reports meet the above requirements. All Progress Reports shall be submitted by the tenth (10) day of the month in which they are due after the Effective Date of this Decree. Unless otherwise specified, Progress Reports and any other documents submitted pursuant to this Decree shall be sent by hard copy and electronic copy to Ecology's project coordinator.

### XXIV. EXTENSION OF SCHEDULE

A. An extension of schedule shall be granted only when a request for an extension is submitted in a timely fashion, generally at least thirty (30) days prior to expiration of the deadline for which the extension is requested, and good cause exists for granting the extension. All extensions shall be requested in writing. The request shall specify the reason(s) the extension is needed.

An extension shall only be granted for such period of time as Ecology determines is reasonable under the circumstances. Ecology may grant schedule extensions exceeding ninety (90) days only as a result of:

- (1) Delays in the issuance of a necessary permit which was applied for in a timely manner; or
  - (2) Other circumstances deemed exceptional or extraordinary by Ecology; or
  - (3) Endangerment as described in Section XXV.

A requested extension shall not be effective until approved by Ecology or, if required, by the Court. Ecology shall act upon any written request for extension in a timely fashion. Ecology shall give EHA written notification in a timely fashion of any extensions granted pursuant to this Decree. Unless the extension is a substantial change, it shall not be necessary to amend the Decree pursuant to Section XIV (Amendment of Consent Decree) when a schedule extension is granted.

- B. The burden shall be on EHA to demonstrate to the satisfaction of Ecology that the request for such extension has been submitted in a timely fashion and that good cause exists for granting the extension. Good cause includes, but is not limited to:
- (1) Circumstances beyond the reasonable control and despite the due diligence of EHA, including delays caused by unrelated third parties or Ecology, such as (but not limited to) delays by Ecology in reviewing, approving, or modifying documents submitted by EHA; or

- (2) The unavailability of the Asarco Tacoma Smelter for disposal of the materials to be removed under this Decree; or
- (3) Acts of God, including fire, flood, blizzard, extreme temperatures, storm, or other unavoidable casualty; or
  - (4) Endangerment as described in Section XXV.

However, neither increased costs of performance of the terms of the Decree nor changed economic circumstances shall be considered circumstances beyond the reasonable control of EHA.

#### XXV. ENDANGERMENT

If, for any reason, Ecology determines that any activity being performed at the Site pursuant to this Decree is creating or has the potential to create a danger to human health or the environment, Ecology may direct EHA to cease such activities for such period of time as it deems necessary to abate the danger. EHA shall immediately comply with such direction.

If, for any reason, EHA determines that any activity being performed at the Site pursuant to this Decree is creating or has the potential to create a danger to human health or the environment, EHA may cease such activities. EHA shall notify Ecology's project coordinator as soon as possible, but no later than twenty-four (24) hours after making such determination or ceasing such activities. Upon Ecology's direction, EHA shall provide Ecology with documentation of the basis for the determination or cessation of such activities. If Ecology disagrees with EHA's cessation of activities, it may direct EHA to resume such activities.

If Ecology concurs with or directs a work stoppage pursuant to this Section, EHA's obligations with respect to the ceased activities shall be suspended until Ecology determines the danger is abated, and the time for performance of such activities, as well as the time for any other work dependent upon such activities, shall be extended, in accordance with Section XXIV (Extension of Schedule), for such period of time as Ecology determines is reasonable under the circumstances.

Nothing in this Order shall limit the authority of Ecology, its employees, agents, or contractors to take or require appropriate action in the event of an emergency.

### XXVI. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Public Participation Plan for the remediation of the Fenced Area of the Site pursuant to the terms of this Decree, is attached as Exhibit E. Ecology shall maintain the responsibility for public participation at the Site. However, EHA shall cooperate with Ecology, and shall:

- A. If agreed to by Ecology, prepare drafts of public notices and fact sheets at important stages of the remedial action, such as the submission of work plans, Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study reports and engineering design reports. As appropriate, Ecology will edit, finalize, and distribute such fact sheets and prepare and distribute public notices of Ecology's presentations and meetings;
- B. Notify Ecology's project coordinator prior to the preparation of all press releases and fact sheets, and before meetings with the interested public and local governments. Likewise, Ecology shall notify EHA prior to the issuance of all press releases and fact sheets, and before meetings with the interested public and local governments. For all press releases, fact sheets, meetings, and other outreach efforts by EHA that do not receive prior Ecology approval, EHA shall clearly indicate to its audience that the press release, fact sheet, meeting, or other outreach effort was not sponsored or endorsed by Ecology;
- C. If agreed to by Ecology, participate in public presentations on the progress of the remedial action at the Site. Participation may be through attendance at public meetings to assist in answering questions, or as a presenter;
- D. In cooperation with Ecology, assist in maintaining information repositories to be located at the following locations:

**Department of Ecology Northwest Regional Office**, Central Files
3190 160<sup>th</sup> Avenue SE
Bellevue, WA

PROSPECTIVE PURCHASER CONSENT DECREE RE: EVERETT SMELTER FENCED AREA, EVERETT, WASHINGTON - 32

### **Everett Public Library**

2702 Hoyt Avenue Everett, WA 98201 425-257-8000

At a minimum, copies of all public notices, fact sheets, and press releases; all quality assured ground water, surface water, soil sediment, and air monitoring data; remedial actions plans, supplemental remedial planning documents, and all other similar documents relating to performance of the remedial action required by this Decree shall be promptly placed in the Northwest Regional Office repository.

# XXVII. DURATION OF DECREE AND RETENTION OF JURISDICTION; CERTIFICATIONS BY ECOLOGY

This remedial program described in the Decree shall be maintained and continued until EHA has received written notification by Ecology that the requirements of this Decree have been satisfactorily completed. This Decree shall remain in effect until dismissed by the Court. When dismissed, Section XVII (Covenant Not to Sue) and Section XVI (Contribution Protection) of this Decree, shall survive.

In order to facilitate the timely redevelopment of the Fenced Area, upon completion and confirmation of the remediation activities specified in the Scope of Work herein (the FCAP/FEIS, the Interim Action Report and the Final Design Report), Ecology may issue a Partial Certificate of Completion where appropriate on a parcel by parcel basis, after consulting with the City of Everett and after City of Everett approval of the Final Site Restoration Plan and work completed under that plan for any parcel in question, noting that redevelopment may proceed based only upon the implementation of any required institutional controls, including Restrictive Covenants that are made applicable to any parcel in question under the terms of this Decree. In the alternative, upon completion and confirmation of the remediation activities specified in the Scope of Work herein (the FCAP/FEIS, the Interim Action Report and the Final

13

15

23

21

26

Design Report), after consultation with the City of Everett, and upon implementation of institutional controls and City of Everett approval of the\_-planned project and any associated replattingFinal Site Restoration Plan and work completed under that plan, Ecology will issue a Certificate of Completion. Unless Ecology becomes aware of any circumstances at the Site that present a previously unknown threat to human health or the environment, Ecology shall, within thirty (30) days of issuance of the Certificate of Completion, propose to remove the Site from the Hazard Sites List, pursuant to WAC 173-340-330(7).

#### WITHDRAWAL OF CONSENT XXVIII.

If the Court withdraws its consent, this Decree shall be null and void at the option of any party and the accompanying complaint shall be dismissed without costs and without prejudice. In such an event, no party shall be bound by the requirements of this Decree. This Section shall not create a basis for withdrawal of consent or termination of this Decree other than those created by the terms of this Decree or that exist by operation of law or equity.

### XXIX. IMPLEMENTATION OF REMEDIAL ACTION

If Ecology determines that EHA has failed without good cause to implement the remedial action, in whole or in part, Ecology may, after notice to EHA, perform any or all portions of the remedial action that remain incomplete. If Ecology performs all or portions of the remedial action because of the EHA's failure to comply with its obligations under this Decree, EHA shall reimburse Ecology for the costs of doing such work in accordance with Section VIII (Ecology Costs), provided that EHA is not obligated under this Section to reimburse Ecology for costs incurred for work inconsistent with or beyond the scope of this Decree.

#### XXX. INDEMNIFICATION

EHA agrees to indemnify and save and hold the State of Washington, its employees, and agents harmless from any and all claims or causes of action for death or injuries to persons or for loss or damage to property arising from or on account of acts or omissions of EHA, its officers, employees, agents, or contractors in entering into and implementing this Decree.

15 16

17 18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26.

However, EHA shall not indemnify the State of Washington nor save nor hold its employees and agents harmless from any claims or causes of action arising out of the negligent acts or omissions of the State of Washington, or employees or agents of the State in implementing the activities pursuant to this Decree.

### XXXI. CLAIMS AGAINST THE STATE

EHA hereby agrees that it will not seek to recover any costs accrued in implementing the remedial action required by this Decree from the State of Washington or any of its agencies. This Section does not limit EHA from applying for grant funding from the Local Toxics Control Account for a portion of the costs incurred in implementing this Decree. Except as provided above, however, EHA expressly reserves its right to seek to recover any costs incurred in implementing this Decree from any other PLP.

#### **SEVERABILITY** XXXII.

If any section, subsection, sentence or clause of this Decree is found to be illegal, invalid or unenforceable, such illegality, invalidity or unenforceability will not affect the illegality or enforceability of this Decree as a whole or of any other section, subsection, sentence or clause.

#### **EFFECTIVE DATE** XXXIII.

The Effective Date of this Decree is the final date when both the Decree is entered by the Court and title to the Asarco Property vests in EHA. If EHA does not take title to the Asarco Property, this Decree shall be void.

The undersigned Parties enter into this Prospective Purchaser Consent Decree on the date specified below.

STATE OF WASHINGTON DEPARTMENT OF ECOLOGY CHRISTINE O. GREGOIRE Attorney General

James J. Pendowski Program Manager

Kristie E. Carevich, WSBA No. 28018 Assistant Attorney General

PROSPECTIVE PURCHASER CONSENT DECREE RE: EVERETT SMELTER FENCED AREA, EVERETT, WASHINGTON - 35

1	Toxics Cleanup Program		
2	Date:	Date:	
3			
4			
5	HOUSING AUTHORITY OF THE CITY OF EVERETT		
6			
7			
8			
9	Date:		
10	ENTERED this day of	2004.	
11	ENTERED this day or		
12	Jī S	UDGE nohomish County Superior Court	
13		monomism county superior court	
14			
15			
16			
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			
26		· ·	
	PROSPECTIVE PURCHASER CONSENT DECREE RE: EVERETT SMELTER FENCED AREA, EVERETT, WASHINGTON - 36		